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OVERVIEW
- talked about in-kernel building blocks:
  - threads
  - memory
  - IPC
- drivers will enable access to a wide range of non-kernel resources
- need to manage resources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>discrete, limited</td>
<td>continuous, infinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hidden in the system</td>
<td>user-perceivable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managed by pager</td>
<td>managed by scheduler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>page-granular partitions</td>
<td>arbitrary granularity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all pages are of equal value</td>
<td>value depends on workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active policy decisions,</td>
<td>active policy decisions, active enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hierarchical management</td>
<td>Fiasco: flattened in-kernel view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REAL-TIME
a real-time system denotes a system, whose correctness depends on the timely delivery of results

“it matters, when a result is produced”

real-time denotes a predictable relation between system progress and wall-clock time
Examples

- Engine control in a car
- Break-by-wire
- Avionics
- Railway control

Focused catastrophic failures

- Set-top box DVD player
- GSM-stack in your cell phone

Benign failures complex
① Predictability
② Guarantees
③ Enforcement
PREDICTABILITY
- gap between worst and average case
- memory caches, disk caches, TLBs
- “smart” hardware
- system management mode
- disk request reordering
- cross-talk from resource sharing
- servers showing $O(n)$ behavior
- SMP
- external influences: interrupts
CROSSCUTTING

Applications

System Services

Kernel

Hardware
CUSTOM RTOS

- small real-time executives tailor-made for specific applications
- fixed workload known a priori
- pre-calculated time-driven schedule
- used on small embedded controllers
- benign hardware
- full Linux kernel and real-time processes run side-by-side
- small real-time executive underneath supports scheduling and IPC
- real-time processes implemented as kernel modules
- all of this runs in kernel mode
- no isolation
- the kernel used in OS X and iOS
- offers a real-time priority band above the priority of kernel threads
- interface: “I need X time with a Y period.”
- threads exceeding their assignment will be demoted
- all drivers need to handle interrupts correctly
- static thread priorities
- O(1) complexity for most system calls
- fully preemptible in kernel mode
  - bounded interrupt latency
- lock-free synchronization
  - uses atomic operations
- wait-free synchronization
  - locking with helping instead of blocking
- “real-time” architecture for those afraid of touching the OS
- example: Real-Time Java
- A real-time kernel alone is not enough.
- Microkernel solution: temporal isolation.
  - Eliminates cross-talk through system calls.
  - Interrupt handling controlled by scheduler.
- User-level servers as resource managers.
  - Implement real-time views on specific resources.
- Real-time is not only about CPU.
- worst case execution time (WCET) largely exceeds average case
- offering guarantees for the worst case will waste lots of resources
- missing some deadlines can be tolerated with the firm and soft real-time flavors
desktop real-time

there are no hard real-time applications on desktops

there is a lot of firm and soft real-time
  - low-latency audio processing
  - smooth video playback
  - desktop effects
  - user interface responsiveness
H.264 DECODING

WCET
guarantees even slightly below 100% of WCET can dramatically reduce resource allocation

- unused reservations will be used by others at runtime

- use probabilistic planning to model the actual execution

- quality q: fraction of deadlines to be met
KEY IDEA
\[ r_i' = \min(r \in \mathbb{R} \mid \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} P(X_i + k \cdot Y_i \leq r) \geq q_i) \]

\[ r_i = \max(r_i', w_i) \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \]

- to fully understand this (or not): see real-time systems lecture
- good for microkernel: reservation can be calculated by a userland service
- kernel just needs to support static priorities
scheduling = admission + enforcement

admission = scheduling analysis
- verifies the feasibility of client requests
- formal task model
- calculates task parameters
- can reject requests

enforcement
- executing the schedule
- preempt when reservation expires
ENFORCEMENT
- executed at specific events
- enforces task parameters by preemption
  - e.g. on deadline overrun
- picks the next thread
  - static priorities (e.g. RMS, DMS)
  - dynamic priorities (e.g. EDF)
- seems simple...
- high priority thread calls low priority service, medium priority thread interferes:

1 waits for 3 ✔
3 waits for 2 ✔
= 1 waits for 2 ✗

Priority Inversion
• priority inheritance, priority ceiling
• nice mechanism for this in Fiasco, NOVA: timeslice donation
• split thread control block
  • execution context: holds CPU state
  • scheduling context: time and priority
• on IPC-caused thread switch, only the execution context is switched
- IPC receiver runs on the sender’s scheduling context
- priority inversion problem solved with priority inheritance
- servers run on their clients’ time slice
- when the server executes on behalf of a client, the client pays with its own time
- this allows for servers with no scheduling context
  - server has no time or priority on its own
  - can only execute on client’s time
  - relieves scheduler from dealing with servers
OPEN ISSUES

- servers could be malicious, so you need timeouts to get your time back
  - now, malicious clients can call the server with a very short timeout
  - on what time will the server do cleanup?
- donation does not work across CPUs
  - would thwart admission; one CPU cannot execute on behalf of another
- migrate servers or clients?
OPTIMIZATION
- IPC only in the contention case
- optimized for low contention
- bad for producer-consumer problems
- reduce from 2 IPCs to one
- how to protect the short critical section?
- spinlocks suffer lockholder preemption
- allow threads to have short periods where they are never preempted
  - like a low cost global system lock
  - like a userland flavor of disabling interrupts
- **delayed preemption**
- threads set “don’t preempt” flag in UTCB
  - very low cost
  - not a lock, no lockholder preemption
- unbounded delay
  - kernel honors the delayed preemption flag only for a fixed maximum delay
  - what delay is useful?
- delay affects all threads
  - effect can be limited to a priority band
  - must be included in real-time analysis
- does not work across multiple CPUs
■ managing time is necessary
■ we interact with the system based on time
■ real-time is a cross-cutting concern
■ heavy-math admission in userland, simple priorities in the kernel
■ priority inheritance by timeslice donation
■ synchronisation, delayed preemption
■ next week: drivers